

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
WACO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	§	
	§	
vs.	§	NO: WA:19-CR-00116(2)-ADA
	§	
(2) MONIKA HEIDI BRACKETT	§	

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**  
**OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the court is the above styled and numbered cause. On December 3, 2024 the United States Probation Office filed a Petition For Warrant or Summons For Offender Under Supervision for Defendant (2) MONIKA HEIDI BRACKETT, which alleged that Brackett violated a condition of her supervised release and recommended that Brackett 's supervised release be revoked (Clerk's Document No. 101). A warrant issued and Brackett was arrested. On February 19, 2025, Brackett appeared before a United States Magistrate Judge, was ordered detained, and a revocation of supervised release hearing was set.

Brackett appeared before the magistrate judge on March 4, 2025, waived her right to a preliminary hearing and to be present before the United States District Judge at the time of modification of sentence, and consented to allocution before the magistrate judge. Following the hearing, the magistrate judge signed his report and recommendation on March 5, 2025, which provides that having carefully considered all of the arguments and evidence presented by the Government and Defendant, based on the original offense and

the intervening conduct of Brackett, the magistrate judge recommends that this court revoke Brackett supervised release and that Brackett be sentenced to imprisonment for SIX (6) months, with no term supervised release to follow the term of imprisonment, and with credit for time served. It is further RECOMMENDED that, to the extent possible, Defendant be placed in a Federal Bureau of Prisons facility located near Waco, Texas (Clerk's Document No. 114).

A party may serve and file specific, written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation, and thereby secure a *de novo* review by the district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). A party's failure to timely file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation in a report and recommendation bars that party, except upon grounds of plain error, from attacking on appeal the unobjected-to proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the district court. *Douglass v. United Services Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415 (5th Cir. 1996) (*en bane*). The parties in this cause were properly notified of the consequences of a failure to file objections.

On March 4, 2025, following the hearing on the motion to revoke supervised release, all parties signed a Waiver Of Fourteen Day Rule For Filing Objections To Report and Recommendation Of United States Magistrate Judge (Clerk's Document No. 113). The court, having reviewed the entire record and finding no plain error, accepts


and adopts the report and recommendation filed in this cause.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge filed in this cause (Clerk's Document No. 114 ) is hereby **ACCEPTED AND ADOPTED** by this court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant (2) MONIKA HEIDI BRACKETT's term of supervised release is hereby **REVOKED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant (2) MONIKA HEIDI BRACKETT be imprisoned for SIX (6) months with no term of supervised release, with credit for time served. It is further **RECOMMENDED** that, to the extent possible, Defendant be placed in a Federal Bureau of Prisons facility located near Waco, Texas.

Signed this 7th day of March, 2025.

  
ALAN D ALBRIGHT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE